



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/733,808	12/10/2003	Chris A. Hopen	PA4407US	8851
22830	7590	10/01/2008	EXAMINER	
CARR & FERRELL LLP 2200 GENG ROAD PALO ALTO, CA 94303			JOO, JOSHUA	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
		2154		
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
10/01/2008	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/733,808	Applicant(s) HOPEN ET AL.
	Examiner JOSHUA JOO	Art Unit 2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 August 2008.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 14 February 2008 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-166/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

Detailed Action

1. This Office action is in response to communication dated 08/14/2008.

Claims 1-23 are pending for examination.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(c), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(c) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 08/14/2008 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 08/14/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argued that:

4. (1) O'Neil et al. US Patent #6,128,279 (O'Neil hereinafter) does not teach the amended feature of a working status indicating whether the at least one platform service is running.

5. In response, Examiner respectfully disagrees that O'Neil does not teach the amended feature. As indicated in the Office action dated 06/20/2008, O'Neil teaches of monitoring a working status of a server that includes load, operating capacity, and whether load exceeds a predetermined level.

6. O'Neil further teaches,

"server 7 determines a load (e.g., the number and/or complexity of network requests) that it is currently processing, and the capacity remaining therein. Step S203 decides if the load currently being processed in server 7 exceeds a first predetermined level. In preferred embodiments of the invention, this predetermined level is 50%, meaning that server 7 is operating at 50% capacity... If step S203 decides that the server 7 is not processing a load that exceeds the first predetermined level, flow proceeds to step S204." (col. 6, lines 17-33)

7. According to O’Neil, the load is an indication of an amount of work that the server is currently processing and may be represented by a percentage (See above passage). A server that is currently processing is a running server. Therefore, the load or the determination of a positive operating capacity percentage provides an indication that the server is running. Furthermore, the load also indicates a capacity at which the server is running, and the decision of whether operating capacity exceeds a predetermined threshold also provides an indication of whether the server is running above or below the predetermined level.

Drawings

8. The drawings dated 02/14/2008 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the feature of a “working status indicating whether the at least one platform service is running” must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either “Replacement Sheet” or “New Sheet” pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be

notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

9. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

10. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

11. Regarding claim 1, Applicant is seeking to patent a network appliance comprising of at least one platform service, a service monitor, and a load balancer. According to Applicant's specification, Applicant intends for the platform service, the service monitor, and the load balancer to be implemented as software (See page 12, paragraph 0050; page 22, paragraph 60; page 43, paragraph 115). Therefore, the claimed invention of a network appliance comprises only software and is directed to a software appliance. Software does not meet one of the four categories of invention and is not statutory. Specifically, software is not a series of steps or acts and thus is not a process. Software is not a physical article or object and as such is not a machine or manufacture. Software is not a combination of substances and therefore not a composition of matter.

12. Regarding claim 11, Applicant is seeking to patent a system comprising of a first network appliance comprising a platform service, a service monitor, and a load balancer, and a second network appliance comprising a platform service and a load balancer. According to Applicant's specification, Applicant intends for the platform service, the service monitor, and the load balancer to be implemented as software (See page 12, paragraph 0050; page 22, paragraph 60; page 43, paragraph 115). Therefore, the network appliances are directed only to software, and the claimed system comprising the network appliances is directed only to software. Software does not meet one of the four categories of invention

and is not statutory. Specifically, software is not a series of steps or acts and thus is not a process.

Software is not a physical article or object and as such is not a machine or manufacture. Software is not a combination of substances and therefore not a composition of matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

13. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

14. Claims 1-3, 5, 11-12, 14, 17, 20-21, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by O'Neil.

15. As per claim 1, O'Neil teaches the invention as claimed including a network appliance, comprising:

at least one platform service (col. 5, lines 45. Process request. col. 4, line 65-col. 5, line 6.

Server may be a WWW, CORBA, ORB, SMTP server.);

a service monitor that monitors a working status of the at least one platform service using interprocess communications, the working status indicating whether the at least one platform service is running (col. 6, lines 27-32. Determine load that the server is currently processing and whether operating capacity exceeds a predetermined level.); and

a load balancer that performs load balancing on received communications based on at least the working status of the at least one platform service (col. 6, lines 34-36. Determine that the load exceeds a predetermined level. col. 7, lines 24-31. Route the network request to another server.).

16. As per claim 11, O'Neil teaches the invention as claimed including a system comprising:

a first network appliance having at least one first platform service (col. 5, lines 37-40, 44-45.

Servers, e.g. server 9, that process requests.), a service monitor that monitors a working status of the at least one first platform service using interprocess communications (col. 6, lines 27-32. Determine load, operating capacity, and whether the a predetermined level is exceed.), and

a first load balancer that performs load balancing on communications received by the first network appliance based on at least the working status of the at least one first platform service, the working status indicating whether the at least one platform service is running (col. 6, lines 27-32. Determine load that the server is currently processing and whether operating capacity exceeds a predetermined level. col. 7, lines 24-31. Route the network request to another server.); and

a second network appliance having at least one second platform service (col. 5, lines 37-40, 44-45. Servers, e.g. server 7, that process requests.) and a second load balancer that performs load balancing on communications received by the second network appliance (col. 5, lines 37-47. Servers include load balancing modules, e.g. module 17. Determine whether to process the request.).

17. As per claim 20, O'Neil teaches the invention as claimed including a method of processing client communications to a network, comprising:

receiving a first client communications at a first network appliance hosting at least one first platform service (col. 5, lines 43-44; col. 6, lines 12-15. Receive request. col. 5, lines 45. Process request. col. 4, line 65-col. 5, line 6. Server may be a WWW, CORBA, ORB, SMTP server.);

employing a load balancer hosted by the first network appliance to direct the first client to the at least one first platform service hosted by the first network appliance based on at least a working status of the at least one first platform service, the working status indicating whether the at least one platform service is running (col. 6, lines 27-32. Determine load that the server is currently processing and whether

operating capacity exceeds a predetermined level. col. 7, lines 24-31. Route the network request to another server.);

receiving a second client communication at the first network appliance (col. 6, lines 11-14.

Network request. It is inherent that a server may receive more than one request. col. 7, lines 40-47.

Requests.); and

employing the load balancer to direct the second client communications to a second platform service hosted by a second network appliance based on at least the working status of the at least one first platform service and a working status of the second platform service (col. 6, lines 50-57. Determine the load of another server. col. 7, lines 4-20. Determine whether the another server is off-line or unable to exchange information. col. 7, lines 24-31. Route request to the another server.).

18. As per claim 2, O'Neil teaches the network appliance of claim 1, further comprising a backplane interface through which the network appliance exchanges data with another device (col. 6, lines 36-43. Modules in servers exchange information. fig. 3; col. 7, lines 47-50. Route request to another server.).

19. As per claim 3, O'Neil teaches the network appliance of claim 2, wherein the another device hosts at least one second platform service (col. 5, lines 37-40, 44-45. Servers, e.g. server 7, that process requests. col. 4, line 65-col. 5, line 6. Server may be a WWW, CORBA, ORB, SMTP server.), and

the service monitor monitors a working status of the second platform service using communications transmitted over the backplane (col. 6, lines 36-44. Determine load of other servers. col. 7, lines 4-20. Determine whether the another server is off-line or unable to exchange information.).

20. As per claims 5 and 14, O'Neil teaches the invention of claims 1 and 11, wherein the at least one platform service is an access method service (col. 4, line 65-col. 5, lines 6. Servers may be a WEB, FTP, or SMTP server, which would provide WEB, FTP, or SMTP services.).

21. As per claim 12, O'Neil teaches the network of claim 11, wherein the second network appliance further includes a second service monitor that monitors a working status of the at least one second platform using interprocess communications (col. 5, lines 37-47. Servers comprise load balancing modules. Module includes process steps to determine whether to process a request. col. 6, lines 18-29. Determine the load, operating capacity, and whether load exceeds a predetermined level.).

22. As per claim 17, O'Neil teaches the network of claim 11, wherein the at least second platform service is an access method service (col. 4, line 65-col. 5, lines 6. Servers may be a server that provides WEB, FTP, SMTP services.).

23. As per claim 21, O'Neil teaches the method of claim 20, further comprising: analyzing the first client communications to determine if the first client communications includes association data indicating that the first client communication is associated with the at least one first platform service; and determining that the first client communication includes association data indicating that the first communications is associated with the at least one first platform service. (col. 4, line 66-col. 5, line 6. Servers may be WWW, CORBA, FTP, SMTP servers. col. 6, lines 12-15, 29-32. Request is processed, and server outputs a response. For the request to be properly processed or service the request, the request comprises information indicating what service is being requested or associated with the request, e.g. http get request, email transmission.)

24. As per claim 23, O'Neil teaches the method of claim 20, further comprising:
executing a load balancing algorithm to determine whether the second client communication
should be directed to the second platform service (col. 6, lines 11-14. Network request. It is inherent that
a server may receive more than one request. col. 7, lines 40-47. Requests. col. 6, lines 21-24, 36-41.
Determine load and the loads of other servers.); and
determining that the second client communications should be directed to the second platform
service based upon results of the executed load balancing algorithm (col. 7, lines 1-3, 21-25. Determine
load and online status to route requests. col. 7, lines 24-28, 45-50. Route request to another server.).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

25. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness
rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the
manner in which the invention was made.

26. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Neil, in view of Rao, US
Patent #6,789,118 (Rao hereinafter).

27. As per claim 4, O'Neil teaches monitoring a working status of the network appliance. O'Neil
does not specifically teach the network appliance of claim 1, further comprising an interface monitor that
monitors a working status of interfaces and connections employed by the network appliance.

28. Rao teaches of a network appliance (switch) monitoring the working status of interfaces and
connections employed by the network appliance (col. 8, lines 10-20, 24-29. Monitor the state of links and
ports).

29. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to monitor the working status of interfaces and connections employed by the network appliance. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Rao's teachings would provide an improvement to O'Neil's teachings by allowing additional monitoring to determine whether a server can sufficiently service network requests. Rao's teachings would also provide an improvement to O'Neil's teachings by allowing recovery from detected equipment faults and links failures (col. 8, lines 17-23).

30. Claims 6-7, 15-16, 18, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Neil, in view of Shanumgam et al. US Patent #7,032,022 (Shanumgam hereinafter).

31. As per claims 6 and 15, O'Neil does not specifically teach the invention of claims 5 and 14, wherein the access method service is a private network service.

32. Shanumgam teaches of a network device providing VPN service (fig. 1, 17; col. 4, lines 34-39; col. 5, lines 37-43; col. 14, lines 35-39).

33. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the server to provide VPN service. The motivation for the suggested combination is that O'Neil suggests desirability of allowing different services by teaching that the invention can be used with different types of servers. Furthermore, Shanumgam's teachings would provide an improvement to O'Neil's teachings by allowing the server to offer a service that allows secure communications on a public network.

34. As per claims 7 and 16, O'Neil does not specifically teach the invention of claims 5 and 14, wherein the access method is an extranet Web service.

35. Shanumgam teaches of a network device providing extranet Web services (fig. 1; col. 4, lines 34-39; col. 5, lines 37-43; col. 6, lines 9-13. VPN service to connect to a public network).

36. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the server to provide extranet Web services. The motivation for the suggested combination is that O'Neil suggests desirability of allowing different services by teaching that the invention can be used with different types of servers. Furthermore, Shanumgam's teachings would provide an improvement to O'Neil's teachings by allowing the server to offer a service that allows secure communications on a public network.

37. As per claim 18, O'Neil does not specifically teach the network in claim 17, wherein the access method service is a private network service.

38. Shanumgam teaches of a network device providing VPN service (fig. 1, 17; col. 4, lines 34-39; col. 5, lines 37-43; col. 14, lines 35-39).

39. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of O'Neil and Shanumgam for the server to provide VPN service. The motivation for the suggested combination is that O'Neil suggests desirability of allowing different services by teaching that the invention can be used with different types of servers. Furthermore, Shanumgam's teachings would provide an improvement to O'Neil's teachings by allowing the server to offer a service that allows secure communications on a public network.

40. As per claim 19, O'Neil does not specifically teach the network in claim 17, wherein the access method is an extranet Web service.

41. Shanumgam teaches of a network device providing extranet Web services (fig. 1; col. 4, lines 34-39; col. 5, lines 37-43; col. 6, lines 9-13. VPN service to connect to a public network).

42. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of O'Neil and Shanumgam for the server to provide extranet Web services. The motivation for the suggested combination is that O'Neil suggests desirability of allowing different services by teaching that the invention can be used with different types of servers. Furthermore, Shanumgam's teachings would provide an improvement to O'Neil's teachings by allowing the server to offer a service that allows secure communications on a public network.

43. Claims 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Neil, in view of Le et al. US Patent #6,145,089 (Le Hereinafter).

44. As per claim 8, O'Neil teaches determining the working status of the at least one platform service. O'Neil does not specifically teach the network appliance recited in claim 1, further comprising a node manager that determines the working status and provides a determined working status of the at least one platform service to the service monitor.

45. Le teaches of a server comprising a server manager that monitors the working status of a service and indicates the working status to another manager (col. 7, lines 32-46; col. 8, lines 43-46. Monitor functioning of the service or service group. Observe service failure.).

46. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the service monitor as taught by O'Neil to receive a working status of a service determined and provided by a manager as taught by Le. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Le's teachings would improve reliability of O'Neil's teachings by distributing the task of determining a working status to a manager and allowing servers to fail over services to other servers.

47. Claims 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Neil, in view of Jordan et al. US Patent #6,438,652 (Jordan hereinafter).

48. As per claim 9, O'Neil does not specifically teach the network appliance of claim 1, further comprising a distributed cache service that caches information relating to at least one platform on another network appliance.

49. Jordan teaches of a server comprising a distributed cache service, wherein the server caches information relating to another server (col. 4, lines 14-19; col. 7, lines 43-51. Send a copy of cached object p to a cache server.)

50. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the server to comprise a distributed cache service, wherein the server caches information relating to another server. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Jordan's teachings would improve O'Neil's teachings by providing distributed load balancing of cached information, and retrieving content from the cache would reduce the time required to service requests.

51. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Neil and Jordan, in view of Kakemizu et al., US Patent #7,068,640 (Kakemizu hereinafter).

52. As per claim 10, O'Neil teaches that the at least one platform service is an access method service (col. 4, line 65-col. 5, lines 6. Servers may be a WEB, FTP, or SMTP server, which would provide WEB, FTP, or SMTP services.). O'Neil does not specifically teach the invention of claim 9, wherein the information cached includes authentication information and encryption key information for encryption sessions hosted by the access method service.

53. Kakemizu teaches of an ISP (server) providing VPN services, wherein the server comprises cached information that includes authentication information and encryption key information for encryption sessions hosted by the service (fig 7. col. 7, line 58-col. 8, line 17. VPN information cache. VPN information profile comprises identifiers, authentication, encryption keys.).

54. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the cached information as taught by O'Neil and Jordan to include authentication information and encryption key information for encryption sessions hosted by the service as taught by Kakemizu. The motivation for the suggested combination is that O'Neil suggests desirability of allowing different services by teaching that the invention can be used with different types of servers. Furthermore, Kakemizu's teachings would improve the suggested system by providing secure network communications and reduce the time required to process requests.

55. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Neil, in view of Brendel et al. US Patent #5,774,660 (Brendel hereinafter).

56. As per claim 13, O'Neil suggests of a first server (first network appliance) receiving all communications (fig. 3. server 7). O'Neil does not specifically teach the network of claim 11, wherein the first network appliance is configured to receive all client communications to the network unless the first load balancer process fails; and the second network appliance is configured to receive all client communications to the network if the first load balancer process fails.

57. Brendel teaches of a primary load balancer receiving all packets to the network, and a second network load balancer is configured to receive all packets to the network if the first load balancer process fails (claim 14; col. 19, lines 9-14. Backup load balancer takes over if primary load balancer fails.).

58. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the first server comprising a load balancer as taught by O'Neil to receive all packets to the network and for a second device, such as a second server comprising a load balancer in O'Neil, to receive all packets to the network if the first load balancer fails. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Brendel's teachings would provide an improvement to O'Neil's teachings by providing a backup service that allows continued load balancing of communications in the network should a first server fail.

59. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Neil, in view of Kakemizu et al., US Patent #7,068,640 (Kakemizu hereinafter).

60. As per claim 22, O'Neil does not specifically teach the method of claim 21, wherein the association data is a session identifier identifying an encryption session maintained by the at least one first platform service.

61. Kakemizu teaches of providing a session id identify an encryption session maintained by a service provider (col. 7, line 58-col. 8, line 17).

62. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to implement a server providing a VPN service and provide a session id to identify an encryption session maintained by the server. The motivation for the suggested combination is that O'Neil teaches that the invention can be used with different types of servers, and Kakemizu's teachings would provide an improvement to O'Neil's teachings by providing secure network communications and allowing the server to retrieve a client VPN profile to set a VPN path.

Conclusion

63. A shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.

64. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua Joo whose telephone number is 571 272-3966. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday 8AM to 5PM and every other Friday.

65. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan J. Flynn can be reached on 571 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

66. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/J. J./
Examiner, Art Unit 2154

/Nathan J. Flynn/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2154